

A PASTORAL ADDRESS,

BY

JOHN STANNAGE,

Rector of Kemptville,

TO

HIS PARISHIONERS.

PRINTED AT THE CHURCH P. & P. COMPANY, TORONTO, ONT.

1873.

A PASTORAL ADDRESS.

*TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN
KEMPTVILLE, ONTARIO.*

MY DEAR PARISHIONERS,—

It has come to my knowledge that many of you are not pleased with me because I have frequent week-day Services in church (as the Prayer-book directs) and because I have a cross on one of my churches, and because I never can speak respectfully of sects, but think it my duty to denounce them, and to warn you against all Sectarianism, (even as the Bible does) and as I have promised to drive away all erroneous doctrines from my parish, to the best of my ability. "Am I become your enemy because I tell you the truth?" Gal. iv. 16.

Painful as it is to feel that you are offended, I am happy to inform you that I have nothing to retract of what I have said or done, and only fear my not having been explicit enough, and that my natural infirmities may possibly have, to some extent, marred the cause which I wished to promote.

With a view to put the truth more fully before you, and to reach every parishioner more easily than I can do from the pulpit, I have written the following short summary of the doctrines of the Bible and the Church which I feel bound to preach and to teach among you, and without which I could not feel comfortable in my conscience. Permit me, then, to beg of you to pay great attention to the words of Holy Scripture which I have quoted, and to put them above every human, or social consideration. If you do so you will see that the Bible speaks against sects and divisions a vast deal more plainly and reprovably than I ever did. And at the same time I would remind you that whenever I speak, or warn you, against sects, it is not against the good and well-disposed people among the sects that I speak. I thought I had repeatedly expressed myself very fully on this subject. St. Jude, while reproofing very severely "those that separate themselves," says that "of some we must make a difference." Jude xxii. I have always said that there are Christians connected with sects that are honest and sincere, and doing all they can to

please God according to the light that is in them, and even better than some who call themselves Churchpeople. It is not against such that I speak, as I have often told you. These only want more light, and more information, to bring them to their own place. But it is against the *principle* of sects that I can never speak too strongly. That spirit, that evil genius, which has come upon the Christian world, and especially among Protestants, which cuts, and splits, and wounds the Body of Christ, causing it to bleed from all its pores, is the principle against which the whole Bible makes war, and which no honest and enlightened Christian can approve. Nay, it is pleasing to know that even among other denominations at the present day there is a growing spirit of dissatisfaction with this very principle. For it is no less than Popery itself in another form. It encourages every man to take his own erring conscience instead of the written Word and the united voice of the Primitive Church for his guide. Thus men explain the Bible as they please, and 150 sects have sprung up in the world, and all think themselves right. So every man may have a creed of his own and thus become his own Pope. Such a doctrine is not to be found in the Bible, and I verily believe it is now used by the Great Enemy to annihilate Christianity if it were possible. But I am quite aware that for want of information, and training, and owing to many other circumstances, a very large allowance must be made for the case of many members of other denominations, and they should be made to understand that when we denounce sects it is rather in love for their souls than with a view to wound their feelings.

IS ANY ONE TO BE SAVED OUT OF THE CHURCH ?

I understaud that some of you are apt to draw the conclusion that when I denounce sectarianism and speak of the true Church I thereby look upon all outside the Church as eternally lost. I beg most distinctly to state that such an idea never crossed my mind. I believe God, for Christ's sake, will save millions of those who do not belong to the true *visible* Church, because they could not belong to it. Not because they are outsiders, but because they want the information and training which they ought to have. The real nature of the sin of schism is in wilful, stubborn, obstinate, and proud opposition to God's constituted institutions after we have been trained and well instructed in them ; and God forbid that I should consider all those whose lot

is, from their youth, cast among sects, as guilty of this great sin until they are better informed. To the visible Church alone, certainly, the promises are made, but God has nowhere said that He will punish the ignorant as well as the guilty. On the contrary, the Lord says that "they who knew not the will of the Father shall be beaten with few stripes." And many are the instances in Holy Scripture of those who were real servants of God long before they were acquainted with the terms of the covenant in the Church of God's own appointment. Cornelius was one of these, and yet, though his "prayers and his alms came up for a memorial before God," he was required to be baptized, and to unite himself to the visible Church as soon as he was instructed more fully. Acts x.

PASSAGES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, PROVING THE VISIBLE UNITY
OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, AND CONDEMNING DIVISIONS,
OR SECTS, OR SCHISMS OF ALL SORTS.

St. John's, xvii. 21.—"That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me."

It is a well known fact that the greatest obstacle to the conversion of the heathens is the present state of open division among Christians. 'Learn to agree among yourselves,' say heathen philosophers, 'before coming to convert us.'

Rom. xvi. 17.—"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine that ye have learned, and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ but their own belly, (or self-interest) and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." The simple are easily gained by *good words and fair speeches*.

Divisions were ever offences to the Christian Church because they are wounds in "the Body of Christ which is the Church," and therefore to speak softly of sects is to speak softly of the wounds in Christ's Body. And to follow sects, and to encourage divisions in any way is to go directly against Holy Scripture, which commands us to "*avoid them*."

Col. i. 18.—"He is the Head of the body the Church."

I. Cor. xii. 18.—"For by one Spirit are we all baptized into *one body*."

I. Cor. xii. 25.—"That there should be no schism in the body."

I. Cor. xii. 27.—"Now ye are the body of Christ."

St. Paul, in this chapter, proves the visible unity of the Church by the visible unity of all the members of the human body. Can sects do this?

1. Cor. xi. 19.—"For there must be also heresies (or sects) among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." We pray in the Litany against "heresies and schisms," because both these errors were ever classed together.

Philip iii. 2.—"Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the Concision."

The Apostle was here speaking of those who were causing divisions in those times. Dogs tear and scatter the flock. What would you say if he were among us now and using the same language as applied to the makers of sects? The concision is a rent, a split, a cut, made in the body. Can a clergyman be wrong when he imitates the Apostle warning his people against "the concision," or the great sin of schism? This sin has now become so popular that it is almost a virtue. Some actually say *the more sects the better!* Is it worse to speak against sects than to pray against schism? And no dissenter can come to church when the Litany is read without hearing us pray against schisms.

Then see what St. Jude says of those "who separate themselves," (v. 19) "who speak evil of dignities," who "speak evil of those things which they know not," who are "carried about of winds," who are "murmurers, complainers," "having men's persons in admiration," and "perish in the gainsaying of Core!"

Doubtless all this applies to the *makers* of sects more than to those whose lot is innocently cast in among them.

Hear again what St. Paul says: **1 Cor. i. 10.** "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among ye, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." And **v. 18.** "Is Christ divided?" And **chapt. iii. 4.** "For ye are yet carnal. For whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal and walk as men?" **II. Cor. xiii. 11.** "Be of one mind, live in peace, and the God of peace shall be with you."

Now, then, it must be perfectly clear that so much could not be said about unity and the sin of division if there were no one Church to be adhered to, or to be separated from. A perfectly spiritual *body* upon earth is nonsense. And if all sects form the Church, as most Protestants would now have it, there could be no visible unity, or no such a thing as schism, and the Bible would also speak nonsense. We must, therefore, point out the Church of the Scriptures to understand what sects are, and what schism is.

WHAT IS A SECT ?

A sect is a piece cut off from the main body. It is a branch separated from the main trunk of a tree. The Church of England was never so cut off, and so it is not a sect. If it were a sect, then the Church of Rome, or the Greek Church, would be the only true Church, and we should be all bound to return to it. And to say that all sects constitute the Christian Church is as much as to say that the word sect should be erased from all dictionaries, for there would be no such a thing as a sect, nor could there be any.

WHAT DIFFERENCE IS THERE BETWEEN A HIGH-CHURCHMAN AND A LOW-CHURCHMAN ?

A High-Churchman believes in the Divine authority of the Church handed down to us from the Apostles' time, and called in the creed "Catholic and Apostolic;" a Low-Churchman looks upon the Church as only the best among the sects, but only a sect after all, and so he may leave it, or hold to it as he pleases, and does not think it a sin to separate from it. A High-Churchman would rather believe and obey the unanimous consent of all Christians during the first ages of the Christian era, than to follow his own erring and fallible judgment; a Low-Churchman would rather follow his own opinion, or his own conscience, or the opinion of some clever and popular leader of a party, than the decrees of the Primitive Councils, or the united voice of the Church of God as expressed in the Book of Common Prayer. A High-Churchman has such a humble opinion of himself, or of his fallible conscience, that he humbly bows to his "spiritual pastors and masters;" A Low-Churchman thinks more of his own feelings than of the obedience due to authority. A High-Churchman thinks more of a consecrated place of worship than of a common

house because of God's promise to it ; a Low-Churchman does not see much difference between the two. A High-Churchman thinks it his duty and privilege to follow the rubrics of the Prayer-book even more than the laws of the land, and to be in the House of God for prayer as often as possible on week-days, because the Lord has promised to bless were it but two or three thus assembled in His name ; a Low-Churchman calls all this Popery. A High-Churchman believes that the Lord's Supper is a *real* supper for the soul hungering and thirsting after the righteousness of Christ, and therefore a *real* though spiritual Presence of the Lord whom he worships there more than anywhere else ; a Low-Churchman looks upon the Lord's Supper as a mere form, or badge of union, or a ceremony which no one should approach except when he is perfect. A High-Churchman is not afraid to suffer reproach for being so, or to profess openly his firm belief in God's own institutions in preference to those of men ; a Low-Churchman thinks so little of these sacred things that he is afraid to be called a Papist on their account, and would rather please man. A High-Churchman considers the Episcopal, or " Old Catholic " Church, (as it should be called) as quite distinct from the Papal-Church, and as given to the world to be the 'Depository of the Truth, or " the Pillar and ground of the Truth," as St. Paul calls it, I. Tim. iii. 15., and therefore to be preserved in all its integrity, and purified from time to time, if necessary, through its own Synods, but never by divisions which do more harm than good ; a Low-Churchman does not care much for Divine Institutions of this kind, or he may be too ill-informed to understand them, and so he does not mourn very much over the heresies and schisms which now deform and threaten to annihilate Christianity. A High-Churchman does not call that Popery which is only good to promote reverence and devotion, or a mere ornament ; but a Low-Churchman cannot even bear the sign of the Cross under which he was baptized, and called in the Prayer-book the "*banner*" of Christ ; unlike every good soldier he is ashamed of his own colours, and would rather give them to the enemy !

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A HIGH-CHURCHMAN AND A PAPIST ?

Dissenters and Low-Churchmen take great pleasure in representing High-Churchism as Popery. This is generally done through

great ignorance of both parties. A Papist, that is—an Ultramontane, believes in the Pope alone as the only Head of the Church, as the Infalible ruler of the whole Church in the world, as the "Lord God upon Earth;" but a High-Churchman believes that God gave the government of the Church to the twelve Apostles and their successors, and the Bishops took the place of the twelve Apostles when the latter died. The Lord promised to be with them to the end of the world, and He could not be with them except through their successors. From the earliest history of the Church, even Mosheim, a Presbyterian, admits, that Bishops were looked upon as successors of the Apostles. Hence they are also called Apostles, and "Angels," as those over the Seven Churches in the Book of Revelation.

A Papist believes any decree from the Pope, or any new dogma which the Pope alone will promulge, as, for instance, the late dogma of the "Immaculate Conception," and that on the "Infalibility;" but a High-Churchman only believes in the "doctrine and discipline of the undisputed general councils," that is, the doctrines and Church-government which were adopted and acted upon by all the Bishops in the world unanimously, ever since the Apostle's time, and before any divisions crept in. A Papist believes in the Bible only as explained by the Pope of Rome; but a High-Churchman believes in the Bible only as explained by the Primitive General Councils, and not by every man's private judgment. "No prophecy is of private interpretation." (II. Peter i. 20).

And St. Peter says that some "wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction." (II. Peter, iii. 16).

The Papist believes in the real material presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper; but the High-Churchman believes only in the real Spiritual or Heavenly Presence. The Papist believes in enricular confession as a Sacrament; but the High-Churchman believes in it only as an occasional necessity under great trouble of conscience. The Papist believes in the worship of the Virgin and Saints; but the High-Churchman only remembers their virtues and prays to be made like them. The Papist pays great reverence to images and relics; but the High-Churchman only uses them as we use pictures in our houses, to remember our friends, &c., but never to worship them. God Himself ordered the representation of things in Heaven and Earth in the Temple. The Papist believes that Saints have more

good works than they need for themselves, and that the Pope has a store of these called "Works of Supererogation," which he sells for money; but the High-Churchman believes only in the merits and intercession of the Lord Christ, as the "Only Name given under Heaven whereby we may be saved." More might be adduced to shew the difference between a High-Churchman and a Papist, but surely enough has been advanced to prove that I have no sympathy with real Popery. I am sure I can depend upon the truly honest and humble followers of "Christ and the Church" among you, and I can only pray for those who would rather follow their own way until it shall please God to open their eyes. Revelation and learning are of no use to such persons. We have unhappily permitted our people to lose sight of the true Catholic principles, and to bring them back to these, I can easily see, will require a very great effort. Catholic unity, not Romanism, must be restored. What we must shew first of all is that we have charity for all, but we cannot love what separates good people; and this cannot be done without a long course of patient and plain teaching. We cannot love Christ without loving his own institutions; and we cannot love our neighbours without trying to make them partakers of the privileges which we have in Christ's Own Church; and Churchmen cannot contend for their own Church, as Dissenters do for theirs, unless they are better taught than they have been these many years.

WHAT, THEN, IS THE CHURCH?

The Lord Himself tells us that "if any man will not hear (or obey) the Church he is no better than a heathen man and a publican." Matth. xviii. 17. There must therefore be *one* Church which we must obey or which we may disobey. It is impossible to hear, or to obey, a great many churches at the same time. "No man can serve two masters." St. Paul commands us to "obey them that have the rule over us, and to submit ourselves for they watch for our souls as they that must give account;" Heb. xiii. 17. but if every man can choose a Church at pleasure, or invent a new creed as often as he pleases, what is the use of St. Paul's advice? Or what obedience is there in disobedience? It is plain that to obey the Bible you must obey the Church, or to reject the authority of God's Church is to reject God's Word. And since we live in days when men will, as it was

foretold, "heap to themselves teachers," 11 Tim. iv. 8, it becomes the duty of the clergy to teach, and it is the duty of the people to learn, what the true Church is.

Now, we all know that the Lord Christ, while upon earth, did found a Church which the holy Apostles completed as he had directed. He promised that the "gates of hell should not prevail against it." Matth. xvi. 18. This Church He called His Kingdom, or the Kingdom of Heaven, and He compares it to a field, or to a net, inclosing both good and bad. Matth. iv. 80. He told His Apostles that as His Father had given Him a Kingdom, even so, He gave them a Kingdom. Matth. xiii. 47. "And I appoint unto you a Kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me a Kingdom." Luke xxii. 29. Hence it is as evident as anything can be, that as God commands us to "obey every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake," He also commands us to obey the laws of His Church. The State and the Church are the two great instruments which He has ordained for our guidance, the one for the body and the other for the soul; and we nowhere find that He ordained, or sanctioned, any subdivisions except when approved by those in authority in the Church. On the contrary He says that every Kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation. Matth. xii. 25.

We know the time and date when every sect began to exist, but the beginning of our Church dates from the planting of Christianity in Jerusalem from which it was brought over to England in the earliest age of ecclesiastical history. Thus the difference between the Church of God and a sect is this:—The Church was organized by Christ Himself and therefore is of Divine origin and authority; a sect is organized by man and has only human authority. The clergy of the Church are sent by Christ Himself; the ministers of sects send themselves, or are sent by men having no authority from God. The lawful clergy may abuse their commission, even as a magistrate can, but their commission is from God for all that. "The true Shepherds come in by the door into the Sheepfold," and their punishment shall be great indeed if they neglect their duty. Dissenting ministers ridicule all this, but they would not despise these arguments if they could use them for their own side of the question.

THE SPIRITUAL CHURCH.

I know that you will be told that there is no other true Church than the Spiritual Church, which consists of all faithful believers in all denominations. In that case there could be no visible Church whatever, and all the Scriptures referring to it would be perfectly unintelligible. No one could obey a Church which could not be seen, or known except by God Himself. We must "hear" and "obey" the Church, but how *hear* and *obey* a discordant, scattered multitude? Is it not perfect nonsense? High-Churchmen believe that there are truly honest and sincere people in all denominations, and even among heathens, but that is only until they are better taught. But there is not one word of promise, no covenanted mercies, except to the baptized, and to them that "*obey and submit themselves.*" It thus appears that the Lord naturally wants His people to renounce their selfishness and private judgment, and to be united in love, even the same love as that which led Him to die for them, under His own ministers, His own Sacraments, and His own ordinances, as *one body*, *one* visible body, a body which can be seen and heard, and handled, commissioned by Himself to evangelize the world and to "gather all nations into one fold under one Shepherd," himself the Head over all. But you can easily see that this great work can never be accomplished under the system of division without end, and this is what makes me so sore, and so great an opponent of the principle of Sectarianism. The more I love my fellow Christians, the more I hate the spirit that divides them. I repeat it; God alone knows those that are His. His Church can only be known by outward unity under His lawful ministers and ordinances. "Great swelling words," eloquent and popular speeches, or even great success, do not constitute sterling piety or a valid Priesthood. They who shew the finest appearance of Religion often deceive us most. "To obey," therefore, "is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." I. Sam. xv. 22.

Sectarians will tell you that the Lord did not reprove the man that was casting out devils in his name though he did not follow Him, and therefore they may do the same; but the Christian Church was not yet organized, and they all attended the Temple Service. The man could not be, therefore, making a sect. And the fact that he was working miracles proves nothing in favour of sects, for the Lord says that on the last day some will be rejected though they "cast out devils in His name." Matth. vii. 22, 23.

The shocking state of division into which the Christian world has fallen, produced by the abuse of authority in Rome, and the abuse of liberty among Protestants, and the difficulty of access to such books as should be studied, and the opinion of the leaders of sects being followed rather than the plain words of Holy Writ above quoted, and prejudice instead of the honest investigation of the truth having taken hold of men's minds, it is not easy to inform them, or to convince them against their will. God alone will do that one day, though it may not be before the end of all sublunary things as the natural consequence of all our divisions.

There will, however, always be a small number upon earth who will hold to the truth, and these, like Abraham and Lot of old, will "enquire for the old paths and walk therein," though the whole world should persecute them unto death. Jeremiah vi. 16. It may be said that there are various parties and shades of opinion in the Church of England itself, and it must be confessed that such is the case, and that such has always been the case in any Church, and will ever be the case, so long as we are in this imperfect world. But it must also be evident that one of the parties must be the best and therefore the nearest to the truth. One of these parties must of necessity represent the true Church, and must do all in its power to inform the others as a labour of love until we all come to "the perfect stature of the full grown man in Christ Jesus." They may, indeed, find their task a troublesome one, but their duty is the same; and both clergy and laity are equally bound to contend manfully, though in love, for "the faith once delivered to the saints;" and a part of that faith is this:—"I believe in *one* Catholic and Apostolic Church."

NATURE OF THE CHURCH.

I would not have space to go very deeply into the nature and history of the "One Catholic and Apostolic Church." I can only give an outline of what the Church of England believes on this subject, and refer you to a few books which you can easily procure; and I do this as a duty which I owe to you, and that while sectarians are ever active in defending their own tenets, you may be able to do the same if you are honest and true, and not cowards, towards your own Church.

THE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

That the Church of England believes in the Apostolic Succession of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, you can easily see by looking into the preface to the Ordination of Deacons in your Prayer-book. There it is plainly said that "from the Apostles' time these three orders of ministers have existed in the Christian Church." We also constantly pray for these in the Litany.

The Church further proves the reality of her faith by her practice in rejecting all ordinations but the genuine Episcopal, and by not re-ordaining Romanists who join us because they already have the true ordination. Thus we believe in the Catholic and not in the Roman doctrines. We believe in all that was believed by the Apostles and by the whole Church, before it was defaced by superstition. Whatever was Scriptural, or Catholic, among Romanists, we retained, for we always had it, but rejected whatever was contrary to the doctrine of the Apostles and of the Primitive Church. The Church of England did not begin to exist at the Reformation. She was merely re-formed. And the Apostolic Ministry, and the Catholic Creeds, with the Holy Sacraments, constitute the foundations of the Christian Church, (Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone) as it was always received and understood by all Christians until they were divided into sects of all kinds. Hence our praying in the Litany against "heresies and schisms." Hence our praying that all Christians may "hold the faith in the unity of the Spirit, and in the bond of peace." Hence the Article which says that "it is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same." xxiii. Article. Thus we believe that the Church is "built upon the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone." I. Tim. iii. 15. The same Apostle calls it "the pillar and ground of the truth." History will tell you that the British Church was planted in England five hundred years before the Pope of Rome had anything to do with it. All true Catholic Churches in all parts of the world acknowledge her as a true branch of the whole. There is also one fact worth noticing. It is this:—All sects, and even many Romanists, recognize the validity of our Orders, while we never recognize the validity of Dissenting orders. Hence the hundreds of conversions to us from the ranks of ministers of other denominations within a short time, especially in the United States.

ONE WORD ABOUT THE CROSS.

The sign of the Cross is the banner of Christianity. We are all baptized and enlisted to fight under it. The early Christians, long before Popery, adopted it as their flag and colour to testify to the heathens that they were not ashamed to confess Christ crucified. It is yet in the British Crown, and on the British flag. It is to be seen on all, or nearly all, our churches elsewhere. Go to Ottawa, to Prescott, to Brockville, to Kingston, or to any other city, and you see the plain cross upon the churches. Even dissenting chapels have it. Free Masons have it on some of their regalia. Why then should I be called a Papist because I have placed a beautiful ornament not quite a cross on St. Paul's Church, Marlborough? Is it because Romanists have it? But both Romanists and Dissenters have many good things which they have from us and this is one of them. Can it be possible that any of you should be so ignorant as not to know this? Both Roman and Protestant dissenters have all their best books and best doctrines from the Old Catholic Church which existed long before either of them, and if you have not learning enough to know this, my dear people, you ought not to despise those who know better than you, and who are trying to teach you to be thankful for your privileges. Do you not know that even the Canon of Scripture, that is—what is the genuine Word of God—was declared and established by the Church, in Council, long before the Bishop of Rome claimed his present monstrous authority? How would you know that the Bible is the Word of God if the Church had not told you so? And where do dissenting bodies get the English Bible if the English Church had not fought for it even unto blood. If, then, they do any good at all, it is with the aid of our own books; and they would do a great deal more good without the evil of division, were they united with us against all kinds of errors.

 ABOUT NON-ESSENTIALS.

A great deal is said about non-essentials. You are told that so long as we agree in the essentials of Religion there is no matter to what sect you belong, and that on the Last Day we shall not be asked any thing about forms of church government. This is another way to "deceive the hearts of the simple." When the Lord prays for the visible unity of His Church, that it may teach the

world the truth of His Divine Mission, is that unity a non-essential? Is it non-essential to cut and split the body of Christ to pieces? Is it non-essential to separate very friends, and to cause "the love of many to wax cold?" Or should we not rather reason differently? Would it not be better to look upon non-essentials as not worth making so much division and sin? Can we have the right patience, and long-suffering, and charity, when we allow non-essentials to separate us from the Church of Christ's own planting? Is it a non-essential to introduce disobedience and insubordination in the army of the Lord? And if we must bear with non-essentials in open division might we not bear with them much better, and with less self-will, in unity and love? But can we call all the doctrines that divide sects non-essentials? Are not many of them, in other parts, most heretical? For my part I believe that on the Day of Judgment we shall be asked whether we have obeyed the Church of God, and our "Spiritual Pastors and Masters," just as much as whether we have obeyed our parents; and this, too, is the opinion of the best Divines.

But here again I must observe that we shall be judged according to the light that is in us; therefore it is our duty to "open the eyes of the blind," if it is in our power to do so. But instead of this I believe that most Churchmen are more inclined to please all parties and sects, than all parties and sects are to please them, and such lukewarmness and worldly-mindedness can only be despised by our more honest and candid opponents. Let us please all men, by all means, but never at the expense of truth; and the visible unity of the Church is an essential truth of the Bible, just as much as it is essential "for brethren to dwell together in unity," or the members of the body, to be united in "one body," to keep that body alive and useful in the world.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion I would earnestly recommend you to procure and to peruse attentively, the following books:—Bishop Wordsworth's "Theophilus Anglicanus," in English; Bishop "Kipp's Double Witness," (against Rome and Sectarianism); "John Wesley among High Churchmen," and "A Presbyterian Clergyman looking for the Church."

Praying God that you may all so love Christ as to love and seek the truth and have grace to follow it; and that you may see that the truest charity is to point out error wherever it is, and to draw our friends out of danger, submitting to God's Word, and God's Church, under any reproach, or loss, or persecution, even as Christ and the glorious army of Martyrs that have gone before us.

I am,

My dear Parishioners,

Yours very anxiously,

JOHN STANNAGE.

April 1878.

P. S.—Lending this address to your friends of other bodies, please let them understand that when I try to teach and to warn, it is in love and by no means with a view to wound their feelings. J. S.

